



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,415	07/07/2003	Ho-Won Jung	678-1198	7470
66547 7590 06/02/2009 THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP 290 Broadhollow Road Suite 210E Melville, NY 11747				
EXAMINER				
HUYNH, CHUCK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/02/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/614,415

**Applicant(s)**

JUNG ET AL.

**Examiner**

CHUCK HUYNH

**Art Unit**

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The remarks were discussed on 5/29/2009 over a phone interview.

The arguments/Remarks submitted by the applicant do not take into account the specific cited parts of the references that were used to reject the limitations of the claims, and seem to only generalize the prior art references and then go on to restating the limitations of the claims.

Applicant argued that Tuli discloses a system that allows multiple users operating a personal digital assistant (PDA) receiving information from a server via a cellular phone to access the Internet or World Wide Web (WWW) to remotely view and interact with the information. The information that the PDA interacts with is not a web page.

Examiner respectfully disagrees, as Applicant stated above, Tuli allows the PDA to access the Internet, that alone is an interaction with the web page (abstract and [0002]).

Tuli further discloses that a Web server is connected to the Internet and converts an image of a Web page into a bit map format which is compressed and then sent via the cellular phone to the PDA. Tuli interacts with a bit map image not a web page. In other words, the PDA displays a bit map image of a part of a Web page. As taught by Tuli, the PDA does not interact directly with the Web page but is fed a bit map image

with which the PDA responds. This can cause unnecessary delays and does not allow direct interaction with a Web page when the PDA is not wirelessly connected to the Web server.

Examiner would like to respectfully point out that the independent claims do not require the mobile terminal to directly interact with the webpage. Furthermore, it is known in the art that mobile terminals require an ISP to be connected to the Internet, and directly interact with the Internet via the ISP. The server in Tuli provides the connection to the Internet. Furthermore, it is not recited in the claims whether the mobile client can access web page information when it is not wirelessly connected to the web server; therefore, the argument is moot.

Applicant argues that in particular, in Claims 1 and 8, the automatic storing of the previous display information of a currently displayed web page is performed upon the occurrence of a specific event, namely, when a display screen displayed on the display unit is changed by a web page turning operation. In addition, in Claims 1 and 8, the detecting the previous display information of the web page from the memory is also performed upon the occurrence of a specific event, namely, when a revisit request for a previously visited web page occurs during visiting and scanning a new web page. Neither of these two operations and conditions are taught or disclosed by the cited references.

Examiner would like to direct Applicant to the newly cited rejection, shown below.

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Brisebois describes that a user generates a new super bookmark as per a control by the user itself. In contrast, the independent claims recite storing previous display information including the previous web page and a start position of the last viewed display area on a display unit of the previous web page, when changing a web site.

Examiner respectfully disagrees, and would like to urge the Applicant to actually look at the recited sections of Brisebois previously shown in the rejection. Applicant likes to point out that Brisebois discloses a super bookmark in a different embodiment discloses in Col 7, lines 13+, but ignores the presented sections of Brisebois (Col 4, line 62 – Col 5, line 13 and even to line 32) that do not pertain to the super bookmark embodiment, used by Examiner to reject the claims. This section explicitly discloses the storing of a start position (Col 5, lines 8-11) of a display area of a web page, that when the user revisit will be displayed saving user time from scrolling.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuli (US 2004/0139208) in view of Dauerer et al. (US 6823490; hereinafter Dauerer) in further view of Brisebois et al. (US 6219679; hereinafter Brisebois).**

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Tuli discloses a mobile terminal (PDA- Abstract), comprising:

a display unit (PDA: abstract)

a memory for storing previous display information of a previous web page visited and scanned by a user, the previous display information including the previous web page (storing back pages and previously viewed pages in PDA internal cache memory: Abstract; [0077], [0078]); and

a controller for detecting the previous display information of the previous web page from the memory when revisit request for the previous web page occurs during visiting and scanning a new web page (when user clicks on back button on a current page: [0077]) and displaying the last viewed display area of the previous web page visited by utilizing the previous display information (displaying the previously viewed parts of the web page: Page 11, [0077-0078]).

Tuli discloses all the particulars of the claim including storing previously viewed web pages: [0077], but is unclear about the limitation of:

automatically storing previous display information of a currently displayed web page in memory when a display screen displayed on the display unit is changed by a web page turning operation; and

storing a start position of a last viewed display area on the display unit of the previous web page, wherein the start position corresponds to the last viewed display area on the display unit at a time of the previous visit to the previous web page.

However, Dauerer does disclose

automatically storing previous display information of a currently displayed web page in memory when a display screen displayed on the display unit is changed by a web page turning operation (Abstract; Col 2, lines 6- 10; Col 4, line 58 – Col 5, line 7; Col 6, lines 5-11: accessing the HTML webpage and exiting the page, retaining the exit point location of the webpage, and returning to said location while on another HTML page).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Dauerer's disclosure to display last visited position of a web page (Col 1, lines 39-53).

Tuli in view of Dauerer discloses all the particulars of the claim, but is unclear storing a start position of a last viewed display area on the display unit of the previous web page, wherein the start position corresponds to the last viewed display area on the display unit at a time of the previous visit to the previous web page.

However, Briseboise does disclose storing a start position of a last viewed display area on the display unit of the previous web page, wherein the start position corresponds to the last viewed display area on the display unit at a time of the previous

Art Unit: 2617

visit to the previous web page Col 1, lines 54-66; Col 2, lines 37-44; Col 5, lines 49-53; Col 6, lines 23-34; Col 4, lines 8-39; Specifically, **Col 4, line 62 – Col 5, line 13**).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Briseboise's disclosure to alleviate from repetitive scrolling each time revisiting a web page (Col 1, lines 45-49).

Regarding claim 2, Tuli discloses the mobile terminal as set forth in claim 1, wherein the previous display information further includes:

a uniform resource locator (URL) of the web page (Page 11, [0077]);  
display-information collection time information (Page 2, [0012]); and  
position information of a display area, to be displayed on a display unit (Page 1, [0004]).

Regarding claim 3, Tuli discloses the mobile terminal as set forth in claim 2, wherein the previous display information further includes form-input information contained in the web page (Page 10, [0071-0072]; Page 11, [0077-0078]).

Regarding claim 4, Tuli discloses the mobile terminal as set forth in claim 2, wherein the controller detects the previous display information of the web page from the memory compares a current time with the display-information collection time of the detected previous display information, and displays the web page utilizing the previous display information only if the current time has not exceeded a preset valid time after the



display-information collection time (Page 2, [0012]; Page 10, [0070]; Page 12, [0081]; Page 13, [0082-0083]).

Regarding claim 5, Tuli disclose the mobile terminal as set forth in claim 1, wherein the controller collects display information of the currently displayed web page if a web-page turning command is input, and stores the collected display information in the memory (Page 11, [0077]).

Regarding claim 6, Tuli does disclose the mobile terminal as set forth in claim 1, wherein the controller collects display information of the currently displayed web page if an Internet termination command is input, and stores the collected display information in the memory (Page 11, [0077]).

Regarding claim 7, Tuli discloses the mobile terminal as set forth in claim 1, wherein the controller periodically checks display-information collection time information previously stored in the memory and deletes corresponding display information when a current time has exceeded a preset valid time (Page 2, [0012])

Regarding claim 17, Tuli does disclose the mobile terminal as set forth in claim 1, wherein the controller further determines whether the previous display information is applicable, (Examiner interprets the determining applicability to be determining whether the correct previous display page) (Page 11, [0077]).

Regarding claim 9, Tuli disclose the method as set forth in claim 8, wherein step (a) further comprises the step of:

collecting display information of the previous web page in response to a web-page turning command for the displayed web page and storing the collected display information in the internal memory of the mobile terminal (Page 11, [0077]).

Regarding claim 10, Tuli discloses the method as set forth in claim 9, wherein the previous display information includes:

a uniform resource locator (URL) of the previous web page (Page 11, [0077]);  
display-information collection time information (Page 2, [0012]); and  
position information of the display area, to be displayed on the display unit (Page 1, [0004]).

Regarding claim 11, Tuli discloses the method as set forth in claim 10, wherein the previous display information further includes form-input information contained in the previous web page (which the examiner interpreted the claim as claiming the display information to contain inputted information on the web page) (Page 10, [0071-0072]; Page 11, [0077-0078]).

Regarding claim 12, Tuli disclose he method as set forth in claim 8, wherein step (a) further comprises the step of:

collecting the previous display information of the previous web page in response to a wireless Internet termination command, and storing the collected previous display information in the internal memory of the mobile terminal (Page 11, [0077]).

Regarding claim 13, Tuli discloses the method as set forth in claim 12, wherein the previous display information includes:

a uniform resource locator (UR1,) of the previous web page (Page 11, [0077]);  
display-information collection time information (Page 2, [0012]); and  
position information of the display area, to be displayed on the display unit (Page 1, [0004]).

Regarding claim 14, Tuli discloses the method as set forth in claim 13, wherein the previous display information further includes form-input information contained in the previous web page (Page 10, [0071-0072]; Page 11, [0077-0078]).

Regarding claim 15, Tuli discloses the method as set forth in claim 8, wherein step (c) further comprises the steps of:

c-1) comparing a current time with a display information collection time of the detected display information (Page 2, [0012]); and

c-2) displaying the previous web page utilizing the previous display information only if the current time has not exceeded a preset valid time after the display information collection time (Page 10, [0070]; Page 12, [0081]; Page 13, [0082-0083]).

Regarding claim 16, Tuli discloses the method as set forth in claim 8, further comprising the step of:

(d) periodically checking display-information collection time information previously stored in the internal memory of the mobile terminal and deleting corresponding display information when a current time has exceeded a preset valid time (Page 2, [0012]; Page 10, [0070]; Page 12, [0081]; Page 13, [0082-0083]).

Regarding claim 18, Tuli discloses the method as set forth in claim 8, further comprising the step of determining whether the previous display information is applicable, and wherein the step of displaying the last viewed display area of the previous web page (the saved information from previous visit) (Page 11, [0077]), is based upon the determination of whether the previous display information is applicable (applicability is interpreted to be if the web page was accessed before and displaying the saved information from last visit or needing refresh downloads (Page 11, [0077-0078])

### ***Conclusion***

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHUCK HUYNH whose telephone number is (571)272-7866. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 1pm-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chuck Huynh/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Patrick N. Edouard/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626